

Burns, Marlene

**From:** Alford, Patrick  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 22, 2012 4:06 PM  
**To:** Burns, Marlene  
**Subject:** FW: ballot 2006 Banning

Newport Banning Ranch  
PA2008-114

Please distribute

---

**From:** RODGER hageman [<mailto:evenkeel4@sbcglobal.net>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 22, 2012 4:04 PM  
**To:** Michael Toerge; Alford, Patrick  
**Subject:** ballot 2006 Banning

March 22, 2012

Michael Toerge, Chairman, Planning Commission Patrick Alford, Manager, Planning Dept.

[Strataland@earthlink.net](mailto:Strataland@earthlink.net) [Palford@NewportBeachCa.gov](mailto:Palford@NewportBeachCa.gov)

Gentlemen,

Notice is hereby given that the continued reference to the Nov. 7, 2006 general election as the authorization for the development of NEWPORT BANNING RANCH, then, it appears to be inaccurate.

The Official Ballot, a one page document, makes no reference to the so-called BANNING RANCH. Neither does its page two, a formal "Impartial Analysis by the City Attorney, Measure V," make any reference to BANNING RANCH.

If the authorization is contemplated by reference to esoteric documents such as Land Use Map, Land Use Tables, Land Use Element, "comprehensive update of the General Plan", etc, it also fails to sufficiently notify a ballot reader of the BANNING matter and therefore cannot be authorized by the Nov. 2006 election ballot. It will have to fit the new criteria and stand on its own as any other new development would. Major changes in the land use element surely is entitled to broad public discussion and specific agreement by the public at large.

If the Banning Development were to represent a traffic increase of say, 10,000 to 20,000 daily trips and the Land Use Element states there is to be a reduction in trips by 28,920,

then? If allowable dwelling units be only increased by 1166 units who has to take their house and move to another community to allow for the increase of 1375?

Thank you.

r hageman